

Yvette Davis (Bar No. 165777)
ydavis@hbblaw.com
Arezoo Jamshidi (Bar No. 284220)
ajamshidi@hbblaw.com
Jeffrey Kirwin (Bar No. 345781)
jkirwin@hbblaw.com
HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP
edocs@hbblaw.com
2030 Main Street, Suite 1525
Irvine, California 92614
Telephone: 714.426.4600
Facsimile: 714.754.0826

Attorneys for Defendants THE GUILD LAW SCHOOL DBA
PEOPLE'S COLLEGE OF LAW, JOSHUA GILLENS,
WILLIAM MAESTAS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE
PEOPLE'S COLLEGE OF LAW, CHRISTINA MARIN
GONZALEZ; ROGER ARAMAYO; ISMAIL VENEGAS;
CLEMENTE FRANCO; HECTOR PENA; PASCUAL
TORRES; CAROL DEUPREE; JESSICA VIRAMONTES;
JUAN SARINANA; ADRIANA ZUNIGA; PREM SARIN;
DAVID BOUFFARD; and HECTOR SANCHEZ

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

TODD R. G. HILL,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
OFFICERS AND AGENTS AND
INDIVIDUALS OF THE PEOPLES
COLLEGE OF LAW; et al.

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01298-CV-BFMx

**DEFENDANTS OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
COMPEL DISCOVERY**

Judge: Josephine L. Staton
Magistrate: Brianna Fuller Mircheff

TO THE HONORABLE COURT AND TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR
ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

COMES NOW the Defendants THE GUILD LAW SCHOOL DBA
PEOPLE'S COLLEGE OF LAW, JOSHUA GILLENS, WILLIAM MAESTAS,
BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE PEOPLE'S COLLEGE OF LAW,
CHRISTINA MARIN GONZALEZ; ROGER ARAMAYO; ISMAIL VENEGAS;

CLEMENTE FRANCO; HECTOR PENA; PASCUAL TORRES; CAROL
DEUPREE; JESSICA VIRAMONTES; JUAN SARINANA; ADRIANA ZUNIGA;
PREM SARIN; DAVID BOUFFARD; and HECTOR SANCHEZ (hereinafter
collectively referred to as “Defendants”) submit the following Opposition to
Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel Discovery (ECF 231).

DATED: March 27, 2025

HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP

By: /s/ Jeffrey Kirwin

Yvette Davis

Arezoo Jamshidi

Jeffrey Kirwin

Attorneys for Defendants THE GUILD

LAW SCHOOL DBA PEOPLE’S

COLLEGE OF LAW, JOSHUA

GILLENS, WILLIAM MAESTAS,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE

PEOPLE’S COLLEGE OF LAW,

CHRISTINA MARIN GONZALEZ;

ROGER ARAMAYO; ISMAIL

VENEGAS; CLEMENTE FRANCO;

HECTOR PENA; PASCUAL TORRES;

CAROL DEUPREE; JESSICA

VIRAMONTES; JUAN SARINANA;

ADRIANA ZUNIGA; PREM SARIN;

DAVID BOUFFARD; and HECTOR

SANCHEZ

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Todd Hill (“Plaintiff”) filed another motion that seeks an improper request from the Court. As with his prior motions, Plaintiff does not provide authority for his request. Plaintiff’s motion to compel seeks to compel discovery responses without serving discovery requests on Defendants. Worse yet, Plaintiff seeks to enforce non-propounded discovery based on his intentional misrepresentation of the Court’s order.

II. NO GOOD CAUSE EXISTS TO EXPEDITE DISCOVERY

Rule 26 does not allow a party to seek discovery from any source before the Rule 26(f) conference unless the court authorizes early discovery based upon a showing of good cause. Importantly, the “party seeking expedited discovery in advance of the Rule 26(f) conference has the burden of showing good cause for the requested departure from usual discovery procedures.” *Am. LegalNet, Inc. v. Davis*, 1066 (C.D. Cal. 2009). “Good cause exists ‘where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party.’” *In re Countrywide Fin. Corp. Derivative Litig.*, 542 F. Supp. 2d 1160, 1179 (C.D. Cal. 2008) (quoting *Semitool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron Am. Inc.*, 208 F.R.D. 273, 276 (N.D. Cal. 2002)). The good cause evaluation must include “the entirety of the record ... and the reasonableness of the request in light of all the surrounding circumstances.” *Semitool*, 208 F.R.D. at 275 (internal quotations omitted) (emphasis removed).

Plaintiff claims that he needs “further discovery into accreditation failures, regulatory oversight misconduct, and internal PCL records and communications.” (ECF 231, at 4:17-19.) According to Plaintiff, this discovery is necessary to develop the factual record, narrow disputed issues, reduce unnecessary motion practice and promote judicial economy. (ECF 231, at 6:3-8.)

Haight

1 As an initial matter, Plaintiff has not propounded discovery on the
2 Defendants. Thus, he cannot file a motion to compel if no outstanding discovery
3 exists. Moreover, the Rule 26(f) conference has not been calendared, so Plaintiff
4 must establish that good cause exists to expedite discovery.

5 Plaintiff's motion does not establish or mention any basis that establishes
6 good cause to proceed with early discovery. Good cause does not exist here.
7 Plaintiffs have filed 3 iterations of his complaint, with each one being dismissed by
8 this Court. Currently, the Magistrate Judge has recommended dismissal of Plaintiff's
9 Third Amended Complaint. With the expectation the Court will dismiss Plaintiff's
10 Third Amended Complaint, there is no good cause to expedite discovery. There is
11 currently no complaint, and therefore no claims at issue and no factual allegations in
12 dispute. As such, there is no need to develop the factual record or narrow disputed
13 issues.

14 Plaintiff has yet to file a complaint that states a claims against Defendants.
15 Assuming Plaintiff files a Fourth Amended Complaint, Defendants will almost
16 certainly move to dismiss it as they have a right to do. Plaintiff presents no reason
17 why, much less a good faith basis, for why he should be permitted to conduct
18 discovery without a complaint at issue. Nor has any reason been presented on why
19 he should conduct discovery before Defendants have an opportunity to seek to
20 dismiss any complaint that does get filed.

21 **III. PLAINTIFF MISREPRESENTED THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S**
22 **ORDER**

23 Plaintiff's Motion asserts the Court accepted key facts contained in Docket
24 222 as judicially noticed, so "Defendants can no longer justify withholding
25 requested records or refusing depositions." (ECF 231 3:15-27.) There and
26 throughout Plaintiff's Motion, Plaintiff misrepresents the Court's ruling in its
27 Minute Order on March 5, 2025. (ECF 229.) There, the Court stated that it, "grants
28 judicial notice of the fact that the State Bar of California has reported out such

disparities.” Clearly, the ruling did not state that it accepted the statements in the report as fact. The Court merely noticed that the State Bar reported disparities, not the that disparities were true. Plaintiff misrepresents the Court order and does not provide a basis for good cause to allow for early discovery.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Defendant respectfully request the Court deny Plaintiff’s motion to compel discovery.

DATED: March 27, 2025

HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL LLP

By: /s/Jeffrey Kirwin

Yvette Davis

Arezoo Jamshidi

Jeffrey Kirwin

Attorneys for Defendants THE GUILD

LAW SCHOOL DBA PEOPLE’S

COLLEGE OF LAW, JOSHUA

GILLENS, WILLIAM MAESTAS,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR THE

PEOPLE’S COLLEGE OF LAW,

CHRISTINA MARIN GONZALEZ;

ROGER ARAMAYO; ISMAIL

VENEGAS; CLEMENTE FRANCO;

HECTOR PENA; PASCUAL TORRES;

CAROL DEUPREE; JESSICA

VIRAMONTES; JUAN SARINANA;

ADRIANA ZUNIGA; PREM SARIN;

DAVID BOUFFARD; and HECTOR

SANCHEZ

PROOF OF SERVICE

Hill v. The Board of Directors, Officers, et al.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-CFM

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am employed in the County of Orange, State of California. My business address is 2030 Main Street, Suite 1525, Irvine, CA 92614.

On March 27, 2025, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as **DEFENDANTS OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY** on the interested parties in this action as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

BY CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING: I electronically filed the document(s) with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are not registered CM/ECF users will be served by mail or by other means permitted by the court rules.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

Executed on March 27, 2025, at Irvine, California.

/s/Cindy Mulder
Cindy Mulder

SERVICE LIST
Hill v. The Board of Directors, Officers, et al.
Case No. 2:23-cv-01298-JLS-CFM

Todd R. G. Hill
41459 Almond Avenue
Quartz Hill, CA 93551

PRO SE
Email: toddryangregoryhill@gmail.com

Robert Ira Spiro
Spiro Law Corp
10573 West Pico Boulevard No 865
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Attorney for Robert Ira Spiro
Email: ira@spirolawcorp.com

Jean Roche Krasilnikoff
The State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-1639

Attorney for Defendants Suzanne Celia
Grandt, Vanessa Holton, et al.
Email: Jean.Krasilnikoff@calbar.ca.gov